## REMARKS

The independent claims are amended to include language along the lines of "alerting users of the user terminals of the possibility to start a multimedia service session." Example support may be found on page 11, lines 11-12 of the specification and Figure 5 step 108.

Entry of the amendments along with reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) for anticipation based on newly-applied Ahuja. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9, and 18 are directed to determining the multimedia capabilities of two user terminals when a voice call is set up between the terminals. More specifically, the claims relate to determining the matching multimedia capabilities of two user terminals when a voice call is initiated and informing the user terminals of those matching multimedia capabilities. The multimedia capabilities of the user terminals are determined by sending a capability request to a terminal capability database in which the multimedia capabilities are stored. In addition to providing the user terminals with information regarding matching multimedia capabilities, these claims also specify alerting the users of those terminals of the possibility to start a multimedia service session, if at least one matching device is found. As recited in dependent claims 25-27, the shared session is only initiated by the users if a common multimedia service capability exists.

Ahuja teaches a multimedia telecommunication system that supports simultaneous voice and multimedia communication using virtual meeting services (VMS). Although Ahuja describes the network automatically identifying the multimedia capabilities of the calling party and the called party in response to a call initiated by the calling party, (col. 13, lines 62-65), Ahuja moves the multimedia call forward even if there is a mismatch in the media communications capabilities of

those parties or incompatibility between the communications equipment of the calling party and the called party. Col. 14, lines 11-25. "The network will appropriately configure interface equipment to permit parties having these incompatibilities to communicate with one another in selected media," col. 14, lines 25-28.

As such, Ahuja lacks the feature of "responding to said user terminals with information regarding matching multimedia capabilities and alerting users of the user terminals of a possibility to start a multimedia service session, if at least one matching service is found," recited in claim 1. In claim 1, a voice call is initiated over a circuit-switched network from a first user terminal capable of running simultaneously both a circuit voice call in the circuit-switched network and a shared multimedia service session supported by a packet-switched network towards another user terminal whose multimedia capability may be unknown to a user of the first user terminal. If at least one matching multimedia service capability is found, then a response is sent to both user terminals, in order to inform the users of the existing matching multimedia service capabilities, and this response also alerts the users of the possibility to start a multimedia service session. Because this alerting is performed prior to the establishment of the packet switched multimedia service session, the multimedia session has not already been initiated as it has in Ahuja. This allows the users the option to initiate a multimedia session or not. As recited in dependent claims 25-27, the users may elect to a multimedia session only if a common multimedia service capability exists.

In contrast, Ahuja describes how to establish a shared multimedia session between two users under the assumption that the multimedia session will proceed even if there is an incompatibility between the two user terminals. In fact, Ahuja proceeds with a multimedia call even when one of the user terminals does not subscribe to multimedia services. See col. 15, lines

27-34. Thus, the claimed technology determines whether or not it is possible to start a multimedia service session, while Ahuja describes how to start a multimedia service session. Because the claimed technology permits users to not initiate a packet-switched multimedia service session, the claimed technology saves radio resources as compared to Ahuja's approach.

Various dependent claims stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Ahuja in view of Aholainen (USP 7,280,832) or Vaananan (USP 7,369,864). These rejections are respectfully traversed because neither Aholainen nor Vaananan overcome the deficiencies noted above for Ahuja.

Accordingly, the application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: 
John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100